

youth organizations and "Say No to Drugs" Community Centers, as well as reauthorization of the Runaway and Homeless Youth Act, Anti-Drug Abuse Programs and Local Delinquency Prevention Programs. Additional sections include a program to establish a competitive grant program to reduce truancy, with priority given to efforts to replicate successful programs.

The bill would also reauthorize the Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention Act (JJDP) in a similar fashion to H.R. 1818, a bill passed by the House with strong bipartisan support in the last Congress. This section creates a new juvenile justice block grant program and retains the four core protections for youth in the juvenile justice system, while adopting greater flexibility for rural areas.

Last year, the Senate Republicans tried to gut these core protections in their juvenile crime bill, S. 10. This Democratic crime bill puts ideology aside, and follows the advice of numerous child advocacy experts—including the Children's Defense Fund, National Collaboration for Youth, Youth Law Center and National Network for Youth—who believe these key protections must be preserved in order to protect juveniles who have been arrested or detained. These core protections ensure that juveniles are not housed with adults, do not have verbal or physical contact with adult inmates, and any disproportionate confinement of minority youth is addressed by the States. If these protections are abolished, many more youth may end up committing suicide or being released with serious physical or emotional scars.

I previously described the other titles, programs and initiatives of the Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act when we introduced it. It is a comprehensive and realistic set of proposals for keeping our schools safe, our streets safe, our citizens safe when they go abroad, and our borders secure. I look forward to working on a bipartisan basis for passage of as much of this bill as possible during the 106th Congress and to working with the Administration, with the Department of Justice and with the Department of Education to do what we can to be helpful in the continuing school safety crisis.

Why I am here today is to join with the Democratic leader in his call for a "thoughtful discussion about how to shape a comprehensive national response to the problem of violence in our schools and in our communities." I commend him for including the Safe Schools, Safe Streets, and Secure Borders Act on the priority list that he sent to the majority leader on Monday.

From a personal observation, I recall one time when my children were young, they were in grade school, and I was a prosecutor. Without going into all of the details, a very credible threat was made against me and my family. In fact, one that, had the person been

able to carry it out before being apprehended, all of us would have died. I recall during that time, when the police were coming to me and saying, we will set up this cordon of armed police officers around you, my only concern, and the natural concern of any parent, was for my children; I recall even today the terror I felt in my heart and soul.

I remember today, almost 30 years later, how I felt until I knew they were safe. They were young children. They saw the police officers coming to school to pick them up and for them it was a lark, they were getting out of school early. For their mother and me, it was a matter of some great concern.

Think how parents around this country feel today when they kiss their children goodbye in the morning, and virtually all of them will come back safely, but every parent has to have in his or her soul the thought, what if they don't come back? How does a parent live through this? How do the other students ever go back to a school where this has happened? What about our young people themselves, when they read about this or see this and wonder are they next?

There are two areas of great violence in the world today. One we see unfolding in the former Yugoslavia, where the United States and our NATO allies are trying to stop a person who is exercising war crimes that we have not seen in that part of the world since the time of Hitler. We see the people who are suffering there. Yet some respond by seeing who can get out the best sound.

Then we see this in Mississippi, Kentucky, Arkansas, Pennsylvania, Tennessee, Oregon and Colorado—enough variety of States to tell every one of us that our own State and our own community is not immune.

We are still tempted to dwell on symbols. Symbols do not stop this; substance does. It is not symbolic to set up programs that we know will work, that will allow teachers and parents and police and others to work with students to stop something from happening. That is the key. It is not to respond afterward—and we will respond. We are sending out counselors and investigators and everybody else to Colorado now. How much better, though, if we could respond before it happens.

So I ask Senators when they go home this weekend, pause and think: Do we help solve the problems of Littleton, CO, or the problems of Kosovo, or the problems that face our great Nation, by continuing heavy, destructive, unnecessarily partisan actions in the Senate and in the other body? Or do we come back together, as we have so many times in the past, Republicans and Democrats alike, admit the United States faces many crises and that we solve them only by working together, not in seeking short-term political gain?

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York.

GUN CONTROL

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, first let me commend the Senator from Vermont for his remarks. As always, they are considered and thoughtful and right to the point. His career and legislation has been just the same way. I consider myself, as always, privileged to be here to listen to his remarks. I thank the Senator. I also thank the Senator from Maine for her courtesy, allowing me to make these brief remarks before she makes hers.

Mr. President, as we remain transfixed and horrified by the images of Littleton, as we listen to the stories of the survivors and hear the sobs of the families of the victims, we can feel that America is looking to Congress to do something to keep lethal weapons out of the hands of kids. This morning I watched television as did millions of Americans. My eyes filled with tears, listening to the families of the students talk about their ideal, and to hear them ask what can be done. Since time began, there have been troubled teenagers. We have always sought to help them through their families, through spiritual leadership, through schools. That is nothing new. But what is new today is that it is far too easy for a disturbed young person to get his hands on a gun or a bomb and channel his anger into carnage.

Mr. President, 25 years ago all an angry, troubled teenager had was his fists. Scores of students were not killed when that troubled boy vented his rage. Today we live in a different world. It is no coincidence that the tragedies that we have heard and read about throughout the last year did not occur 10, 15, and 20 years ago with this kind of horror, with this kind of frequency.

In Littleton, we do not know how these two teenagers managed to get their guns. We don't know if they took the guns from their parents or stole them from a neighbor. We don't know if they bought them at a gun show or if they bought their guns off the Internet, although certainly they were immersed in a computer fantasy world, and there are dozens of web sites that offer guns to anyone, anywhere, no questions asked.

We know that gun control alone is not the only solution. We need better counseling in the schools. We have to be more vigilant at identifying and condemning hate groups in schools. But, my colleagues, let us not kid ourselves. It is not possible to confront the epidemic of violence in our schools without dealing with guns.

Yesterday there was a shift in the gun debate that I have never seen before in my career in Congress, and it gives me a glimmer of hope that maybe we can do something to make schools safer. Yesterday, pro-gun lawmakers of Colorado, Florida, and Illinois each withdrew their legislation which would have made it easier for people in those States to buy and/or carry firearms.

They did it because of Littleton. They did it because they know that the

easy availability of guns is part of the problem. They put a stop to their own legislation.

Yesterday, the National Rifle Association scaled back its annual convention, which is to be held in 2 weeks. It will not admit it, but the NRA did it because of Littleton. It will not admit that it is simple common sense that rational gun control equals fewer Littletons, but in its collective heart, the NRA knows that that is true.

So in a small but significant way, the NRA has changed. Now we have to change. Congress has to wake up. America's mothers and fathers are looking to us. To my Democratic and Republican colleagues, many of whom have traditionally opposed gun restrictions, we can pass reasonable, targeted, measured laws that make guns safer and keep them away from kids but still respect people's right to bear arms.

I would like to mention several of these modest measures, measures that will make a great deal of difference and have little or no impact on the people in your State who hunt, who target shoot, who own guns for sport, collection, or protection.

We should pass the parts of either the Kennedy or the Durbin legislation which require adults to safely store their handguns and rifles in their homes. Nearly every day, some kid takes their parent's gun and does something horrible with it. Why? Because half the families who own guns do not lock them away or leave the gun unloaded. We can change that, and we should change that. No one will be harmed, and no one will be inconvenienced.

We have to ban the unlicensed sale of guns on the Internet. It is numbing what a kid can buy simply by going on line and searching gun web sites—handguns, semiautomatic weapons, ammunition feeders; everything is available with no questions asked. This morning, a parent came up to me and said he asked his son how kids get guns. His son answered, without a blink of the eye: "On the Internet."

I have a bill which will stop that. It will have no effect on law-abiding gun owners or licensed gun dealers. Ask yourself: Who needs to buy a gun with no questions asked? The answer is only two groups—kids and criminals. Let's pass this bill.

We should also bring public and private dollars together to develop smart guns. These are guns which contain a device that permits only the owner to fire the weapon. Imagine a gun that is useless when it is stolen, taken without authorization, or sold on the black market. It can be done. The technology is available. I will talk more in the next week about ways we can bring gun makers and the military together to develop a gun that is safe. This could transform the gun industry and make us all rest easier.

Finally, and in the meantime, let's make a strong, secure trigger-lock requirement on all guns. Every car has a seat belt; every gun should have a lock.

Mr. President, each of these measures will make schools, homes, and neighborhoods safer without denying a single law-abiding citizen the right to buy the gun of their choice. How can anyone oppose that?

In conclusion, every time we tune in and see another group of innocent children fleeing from school, we pray that it will be the last time. We can help make our prayers come true. America is waiting for us to do what is right and necessary to keep guns out of the hands of kids. Let's not let them down.

I yield back the remainder of my time.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Maine.

Ms. COLLINS. I thank the Chair.

(The remarks of Ms. COLLINS pertaining to the introduction of S. 870 are located in today's RECORD under "Statements on Introduced Bills and Joint Resolutions.")

MTBE IMPORTS AFFECT U.S. ENERGY SECURITY

Mr. DASCHLE. Mr. President, we are approaching the tenth anniversary of the birth of the reformulated gasoline (RFG) program. This initiative, enacted in 1990 as part of the Clean Air Act Amendments, established strict fuel quality standards for the nation's most polluted cities in order to reduce air pollution. It includes a minimum oxygen content requirement, which was intended to provide an opportunity for America to reduce its dependence on foreign oil through the use of domestically produced ethanol and MTBE.

Reformulated gasoline was introduced in the American marketplace in 1995. Today it accounts for approximately one-third of all gasoline sold in this country.

Congress had several objectives in establishing the RFG program: (1) to substantially reduce harmful air pollutants caused by fuel-related emissions, especially ground level ozone and air toxics; (2) to reduce imports of crude oil and petroleum products, especially those from unstable regions like the Middle East; and (3) to stimulate investment in domestic ethanol and ether plants, thus creating jobs and adding value to grains and other domestic raw materials.

The first objective has been not only met, it has been exceeded. In fact, EPA Administrator Carol Browner has called the RFG program "the most successful air pollution reduction program since the phase-out of lead in gasoline." The other two objectives also have been met, though not to the extent that many of us had hoped.

A major impediment to full realization of the potential of the RFG program has been the importation of massive volumes of MTBE, much of it subsidized by the Saudi Arabian government, into the United States. Domestic ethanol and MTBE producers have been harmed, and American plants have not

been built, largely due to the influx of subsidized product from offshore that makes potential investors unwilling to commit capital to U.S. ethanol and ether plants.

The winners in this situation are the Saudi government and a few multinational corporations. The losers are U.S. corn farmers, butane suppliers and plant workers as well as American consumers who remain potential hostages to foreign energy suppliers.

Mr. President, the benefits of the RFG program have been substantial. However, as we prepare to enter Phase II of the program, it is incumbent upon policymakers to reflect upon whether it is achieving its potential in terms of air quality improvements and oil import reductions.

It seems clear that the answer to the first question is "yes." RFG is generating substantial air quality benefits and even exceeding the predictions that many had made when the original rules were written.

The answer to the second question, however, is a resounding "no." Imports of Saudi Arabian MTBE are growing, and the exclusionary effect of unfairly traded MTBE imports on ethanol usage in key markets such as California has become increasingly problematic.

On April 1, 1999, the International Trade Commission (ITC) held a public hearing on its Investigation No. 332-404, concerning MTBE imports and their impact on the domestic oxygenate industry. This inquiry is timely and important. It will cut through the rhetoric, provide policymakers with a clear picture of the nature and effect of MTBE imports on domestic production and U.S. energy security, and set a factual foundation for discussion of what, if anything, should be done about this situation.

With those objectives in mind, I commend to my colleagues attention the testimony presented before the ITC by Bob Dinneen, Legislative Director of the Renewable Fuels Association, and Todd Sneller, Executive Director of the Nebraska Ethanol Board, that underscores the damage that has been done by unfairly traded MTBE imports. Mr. Dinneen and Mr. Sneller present cogent analyses of the impact that increasing volumes of heavily subsidized MTBE are having on the domestic oxygenates industry. Their testimony should be a warning to us all.

I ask unanimous consent that the testimony of Mr. Dinneen and Mr. Sneller be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TESTIMONY OF BOB DINNEEN, LEGISLATIVE DIRECTOR, RENEWABLE FUELS ASSOCIATION

Mr. Chairman and members of the Commission, on behalf of the members of the Renewable Fuels Association, the national trade association for the domestic ethanol industry, I want to thank you for the opportunity to provide comments today on the Commission's investigation of MTBE. Ethanol and MTBE are competitive additives to gasoline that increase octane and oxygen to